arXiv:1408.5210v1 [math.CO] 22 Aug 2014

# On periodicity and complexity of generalized pseudostandard words

Josef Florian*

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering
Czech Technical University in Prague

florijos@fjfi.cvut.cz

L'ubomíra Balková †

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering
Czech Technical University in Prague

lubomira.balkova@fjfi.cvut.cz

Submitted: Jan 1, 2012; Accepted: Jan 2, 2012; Published: XX
Mathematics Subject Classifications: 68R15

**Abstract**

Generalized pseudostandard words have been introduced by de Luca and De Luca in [7]. In comparison to the palindromic and pseudopalindromic closure, only little is known about the generalized pseudopalindromic closure and the associated generalized pseudostandard words. We present two new results concerning these words. The first one is a necessary and sufficient condition for their periodicity. The second result is a counterexample to Conjecture 43 from [8] that estimated the complexity of binary generalized pseudostandard words as $\mathcal{C}(n) \leqslant 4n$ for all sufficiently large $n$.

**Keywords:** palindrome, palindromic closure, standard words, pseudopalindrome, pseudopalindromic closure, pseudostandard words

## 1 Introduction

This paper focuses on an actual topic of combinatorics on words: generalized pseudostandard words. Such words were defined in 2006 [7] and generalize standard episturmian

*supported by the grant SGS14/205/OHK4/3T/14
†supported by Czech Science Foundation grant GAČR 13-03538S

words, resp. pseudostandard words – instead of the palindromic closure, resp. one pseudopalindromic closure, an infinite sequence of involutory antimorphisms is considered. While standard episturmian and pseudostandard words have been studied intensively and a lot of their properties are known (see for instance [1, 3, 6, 7]), only little has been shown so far about the generalized pseudopalindromic closure that gives rise to generalized pseudostandard words. In the paper [7] the generalized pseudostandard words were defined and it was proved there that the famous Thue–Morse word is an example of such words. The authors of [4] have characterized generalized pseudostandard words in the class of generalized Thue–Morse words. In the paper [5] the authors deal with fixed points of the palindromic and pseudopalindromic closure and formulate an open problem concerning fixed points of the generalized pseudopalindromic closure. The most detailed study of generalized pseudostandard words has been so far provided in [8]:

- The so-called normalization is described that guarantees for generalized pseudostandard words that no pseudopalindromic prefix is missed during the construction.
- An effective algorithm for generation of generalized pseudostandard words is presented.
- The Rote words are proved to be generalized pseudostandard words and the infinite sequence of antimorphisms that generates the Rote words is studied.
- A conjecture is stated there saying that the complexity of an infinite binary generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}$, i.e. the map $\mathcal{C} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined by $\mathcal{C}(n) =$ the number of factors of length $n$ of the infinite word $\mathbf{u}$, satisfies:

$$\mathcal{C}(n) \leqslant 4n \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$

This paper contains two new results:

1. A sufficient and necessary condition on periodicity of generalized pseudostandard words has been found.
2. The conjecture from [8] has been defuted by construction of a generalized pseudostandard word satisfying $\mathcal{C}(n) > 4n$ for all $n \geqslant 10$.

The work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce basics from combinatorics on words. Section 3 deals with the palindromic closure and summarizes known results. Similarly, Section 4 is devoted to the pseudopalindromic closure and its properties. In Section 5, the generalized pseudopalindromic closure is defined and the normalization process is described. New results are provided in the following two sections. A sufficient and necessary condition on periodicity of generalized pseudostandard words is given in Section 6. Last but not least, a counterexample to the conjecture from [8] is constructed and its complexity is estimated in Section 7.

## 2 Basics from combinatorics on words

We restrict ourselves to the binary *alphabet* $\{0,1\}$, we call 0 and 1 *letters*. A *(finite) word* $w$ over $\{0,1\}$ is any finite binary sequence. Its length $|w|$ is the number of letters it contains. The empty word – the neutral element for concatenation of words – is denoted $\varepsilon$ and its length is set $|\varepsilon| = 0$. The symbol $\{0,1\}^*$ stands for the set of all finite binary words. An *infinite word* $\mathbf{u}$ over $\{0,1\}$ is any binary infinite sequence. The set of all infinite words is denoted $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. A finite word $w$ is a *factor* of the infinite word $\mathbf{u} = u_0u_1u_2\ldots$ with $u_i \in \{0,1\}$ if there exists an index $i \geqslant 0$ such that $w = u_iu_{i+1}\ldots u_{i+|w|-1}$. Such an index is called an *occurrence* of $w$ in $\mathbf{u}$. The symbol $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})$ is used for the set of factors of $\mathbf{u}$ and is called the *language* of $\mathbf{u}$, similarly $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{u})$ stands for the set of factors of $\mathbf{u}$ of length $n$. A *left special factor* of a binary infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ is any factor $v$ such that both $0v$ and $1v$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}$. A *right special factor* is defined analogously. Finally, a factor of $\mathbf{u}$ that is both right and left special is called a *bispecial*. We distinguish the following types of bispecials over $\{0,1\}$:

- A *weak bispecial* $w$ satisfies that only $0w1$ and $1w0$, or only $0w0$ and $1w1$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}$.
- A *strong bispecial* $w$ satisfies that all $0w0$, $0w1$, $1w0$ and $1w1$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}$.
- We do not use a special name for bispecials that are neither weak nor strong.

Let $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})$. A *left extension* of $w$ is any word $aw \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})$, where $a \in \{0,1\}$, and a *right extension* is defined analogously. An *extension* of $w$ is then $awb \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})$, where $a, b \in \{0,1\}$. The set of left, resp. right extensions of $w$ is denoted $\mathrm{Lext}(w)$, resp. $\mathrm{Rext}(w)$. The *(factor) complexity* of $\mathbf{u}$ is the map $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) = \text{the number of factors of } \mathbf{u} \text{ of length } n.$$

In order to get the complexity of an infinite word $\mathbf{u}$, the well-known formula for the *second difference of complexity* [2] may be useful:

$$\Delta^2\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) = \Delta\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n+1) - \Delta\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) = \sum_{w\in\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{u})} B(w), \tag{1}$$

where

$$B(w) = \#\{awb \mid a,b \in \{0,1\}, awb \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})\} - \#\mathrm{Rext}(w) - \#\mathrm{Lext}(w) + 1$$

and the *first difference of complexity* is defined as $\Delta\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) = \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n+1) - \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n)$.

It is readily seen that for any factor of a binary infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ it holds:

- $B(w) = 1$ if and only if $w$ is a strong bispecial.
- $B(w) = -1$ if and only if $w$ is a weak bispecial.

- $B(w) = 0$ otherwise.

An infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ is called *recurrent* if every of its factors occurs infinitely many times in $\mathbf{u}$. It is said to be *uniformly recurrent* if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a length $N(n)$ such that every factor of length $N(n)$ of $\mathbf{u}$ contains all factors of length $n$ of $\mathbf{u}$. We say that an infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ is *eventually periodic* if there exists $v, w \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $\mathbf{u} = wv^\omega$, where $\omega$ denotes an infinite repetition. If $w = \varepsilon$, we call $\mathbf{u}$ *(purely) periodic*. If $\mathbf{u}$ is not eventually periodic, $\mathbf{u}$ is said to be *aperiodic*. It is not difficult to see that if an infinite word is recurrent and eventually periodic, then it is necessarily purely periodic. A fundamental result of Morse and Hedlund [9] states that a word $\mathbf{u}$ is eventually periodic if and only if for some $n$ its complexity is less than or equal to $n$. Infinite words of complexity $n+1$ for all $n$ are called *Sturmian words*, and hence they are aperiodic words of the smallest complexity. Among Sturmian words we distinguish the class of *standard (or characteristic) Sturmian words* satisfying that their left special factors are their prefixes at the same time. The Fibonacci word from Example 1 is a standard Sturmian word. The first systematic study of Sturmian words was given by Morse and Hedlund in [10].

A *morphism* is a map $\varphi : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ such that for every $v, w \in \{0,1\}^*$ it holds $\varphi(vw) = \varphi(v)\varphi(w)$. It is clear that in order to define a morphism, it suffices to provide letter images. A morphism is *prolongable* on $a \in \{0,1\}$ if $|\varphi(a)| \geqslant 2$ and $a$ is a prefix of $\varphi(a)$. If $\varphi$ is prolongable on $a$, then $\varphi^n(a)$ is a proper prefix of $\varphi^{n+1}(a)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the sequence $(\varphi^n(a))_{n\geqslant 0}$ of words defines an infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ that is a fixed point of $\varphi$. Such a word $\mathbf{u}$ is a *(pure) morphic word*.

**Example 1.** The most studied Sturmian word is the so-called Fibonacci word

$$\mathbf{u}_F = 01001010010010100101001001010010\ldots$$

fixed by the morphism $\varphi_F(0) = 01$ and $\varphi_F(1) = 0$.

**Example 2.** Another well-known morphic word that however does not belong to Sturmian words is the Thue-Morse word

$$\mathbf{u}_{TM} = 01101001100101101001011001101001\ldots$$

fixed by the morphism $\varphi_{TM}(0) = 01$ and $\varphi_{TM}(1) = 10$ (we start with the letter 0 when generating $\mathbf{u}_{TM}$).

An *involutory antimorphism* is a map $\vartheta : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ such that for every $v, w \in \{0,1\}^*$ it holds $\vartheta(vw) = \vartheta(w)\vartheta(v)$ and moreover $\vartheta^2$ equals identity. There are only two involutory antimorphisms over the alphabet $\{0,1\}$: the *reversal (mirror) map* $R$ satisfying $R(0) = 0, R(1) = 1$, and the *exchange antimorphism* $E$ given by $E(0) = 1, E(1) = 0$. We use the notation $\overline{0} = 1$ and $\overline{1} = 0$, $\overline{E} = R$ and $\overline{R} = E$. A finite word $w$ is an *R-palindrome* if $w = R(w)$, and $w$ is an *E-palindrome* if $w = E(w)$.

# 3 Palindromic closure

In this section we describe the construction of binary infinite words generated by the palindromic closure. Further on, we recall some properties of such infinite words. We use the papers [3, 6] as our source.

**Definition 3.** Let $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. The *palindromic closure* $w^R$ of a word $w$ is the shortest $R$-palindrome having $w$ as prefix.

Consider for instance the word $w = 0100$. Its palindromic closure $w^R$ equals 010010. It is readily seen that $|w| \leqslant |w^R| \leqslant 2|w| - 1$. For $w = 010$ we have $w^R = 010$ and for $w = 0001$ we obtain $w^R = 0001000$. It is worth noticing that the palindromic closure can be constructed in the following way: Find the longest palindromic suffix $s$ of $w$. Denote $w = ps$. Then $w^R = psR(p)$. For instance, for $w = 0100$ we have $s = 00$ and $p = 01$. Thus $w^R = 01\underline{00}10$.

**Definition 4.** Let $\Delta = \delta_1\delta_2\ldots$, where $\delta_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The infinite word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta)$ *generated by the palindromic closure (or R-standard)* is the word whose prefixes $w_n$ are obtained from the recurrent relation:

$$w_{n+1} = (w_n\delta_{n+1})^R,$$

$$w_0 = \varepsilon.$$

The sequence $\Delta$ is called the *directive sequence* of the word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta)$.

**Properties of the *R*-standard word $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(\Delta) \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$:**

1. The sequence of prefixes $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ of $\mathbf{u}$ contains every palindromic prefix of $\mathbf{u}$.
2. The language of $\mathbf{u}$ is closed under reversal, i.e. $\mathbf{u}$ contains with every factor $w$ as well its reversal $R(w)$.
3. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is uniformly recurrent.
4. Every left special factor of $\mathbf{u}$ is at the same time the prefix of $\mathbf{u}$.
5. If $w$ is a bispecial factor of $\mathbf{u}$, then $w = w_k$ for some $k$.
6. Since $\mathbf{u}$ is (uniformly) recurrent, it is either aperiodic or purely periodic.
7. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is standard Sturmian if and only if both 0 and 1 occur in the directive sequence $\Delta$ infinitely many times.
8. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is periodic if and only if $\Delta$ is of the form $v0^\omega$ or $v1^\omega$ for some $v \in \{0,1\}^*$.

**Example 5.** The Fibonacci word $\mathbf{u_F}$ defined in Example 1 is the most famous example of an infinite word generated by the palindromic closure. It is left as an exercise for the reader to show that $\mathbf{u_F} = \mathbf{u}((01)^\omega)$. Let us form a few first prefixes $w_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= 0 \\ w_2 &= 010 \\ w_3 &= 010010 \\ w_4 &= 01001010010. \end{aligned}$$

# 4 Pseudopalindromic closure

Let us recall here the definition of the pseudopalindromic closure and the construction of binary infinite words generated by the pseudopalindromic closure. Some of their properties are similar as for the palindromic closure, but in particular their complexity is already slightly more complicated. Pseudopalindromes and the pseudopalindromic closure have been studied for instance in [1, 7].

**Definition 6.** Let $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. The *pseudopalindromic closure* $w^E$ of a word $w$ is the shortest $E$-palindrome having $w$ as prefix.

Consider $w = 0010$. Its pseudopalindromic closure $w^E$ equals 001011. The following inequalities hold: $|w| \leqslant |w^E| \leqslant 2|w|$. For instance for $w = 0101$ we have $w^E = 0101$, while for $w = 000$ we get $w^E = 000111$. Let us point out that the pseudopalindromic closure may be constructed in the following way: Find the longest pseudopalindromic suffix of $w$. Denote it $s$ and denote the remaining prefix $p$, i.e. $w = ps$. Then $w^E = psE(p)$. For $w = 0010$, we obtain $p = 00$ and $s = 10$, therefore $w^E = 00\underline{10}11$.

**Definition 7.** Let $\Delta = \delta_1\delta_2\ldots$, where $\delta_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The infinite word $\mathbf{u}_E(\Delta)$ *generated by the pseudopalindromic closure (or $E$-standard or pseudostandard)* is the word whose prefixes $w_n$ are obtained from the recurrent relation:

$$w_{n+1} = (w_n\delta_{n+1})^E,$$

$$w_0 = \varepsilon.$$

The sequence $\Delta$ is called the *directive sequence* of the word $\mathbf{u}_E(\Delta)$.

**Properties of the $E$-standard word $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_E(\Delta) \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$:**

1. The sequence of prefixes $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ of $\mathbf{u}$ contains every pseudopalindromic prefix of $\mathbf{u}$.
2. The language of $\mathbf{u}$ is closed under the exchange antimorphism, i.e. $\mathbf{u}$ contains with every factor $w$ as well $E(w)$.
3. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is uniformly recurrent.

4. A close relation between $R$-standard and $E$-standard words has been revealed in Theorem 7.1 in [7]: Let $\Delta = \delta_1\delta_2\ldots$, where $\delta_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\mathbf{u}_E(\Delta) = \varphi_{TM}(\mathbf{u}(\Delta)).$$

   In words, any $E$-standard word is the image by the Thue-Morse morphism $\varphi_{TM}$ of the $R$-standard word with the same directive sequence $\Delta$. Moreover, the set of pseudopalindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{u}_E(\Delta)$ equals the image by $\varphi_{TM}$ of the set of palindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta)$.

5. If $\Delta$ contains both 0 and 1 infinitely many times, then every prefix of $\mathbf{u}$ is left special.

6. In contrast to infinite words generated by the palindromic closure, $\mathbf{u}$ can contain left special factors that are not prefixes. Nevertheless, such left special factors can be of length at most 2.

7. If $w$ is a bispecial factor of $\mathbf{u}$ of length at least 3, then $w = w_k$ for some $k$.

8. Since $\mathbf{u}$ is (uniformly) recurrent, it is either aperiodic or purely periodic.

9. The complexity of $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n+1) - \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) = 1$ for all $n \geqslant 3$ if and only if both 0 and 1 occur in the directive sequence $\Delta$ infinitely many times.

10. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is periodic if and only if $\Delta$ is of the form $v0^\omega$ or $v1^\omega$ for some $v \in \{0,1\}^*$.

**Example 8.** Let us illustrate the construction of an infinite word generated by the pseudopalindromic closure for $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_E((01)^\omega)$. Here are the first prefixes $w_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= 01\\ w_2 &= 011001\\ w_3 &= 011001011001\\ w_4 &= 011001011001100101100 1. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that 1 and 10 are left special factors that are not prefixes. The reader can as well check that $\mathbf{u}$ is the image by $\varphi_{TM}$ of the Fibonacci word, i.e. $\mathbf{u} = \varphi_{TM}(\mathbf{u}_F)$.

# 5 Generalized pseudopalindromic closure

Generalized pseudostandard words form a generalization of infinite words generated by the palindromic, resp. pseudopalindromic closure; such a construction has been firstly described and studied in [7]. Let us start with their definition and known properties; we use the papers [5, 7, 8].

## 5.1 Definition of generalized pseudostandard words

Let us underline that we again restrict ourselves only to the binary alphabet $\{0,1\}$.

**Definition 9.** Let $\Delta = \delta_1\delta_2\ldots$ and $\Theta = \vartheta_1\vartheta_2\ldots$, where $\delta_i \in \{0,1\}$ and $\vartheta_i \in \{E,R\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The infinite word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$ *generated by the generalized pseudopalindromic closure (or generalized pseudostandard)* is the word whose prefixes $w_n$ are obtained from the recurrent relation:

$$w_{n+1} = (w_n\delta_{n+1})^{\vartheta_{n+1}},$$

$$w_0 = \varepsilon.$$

The sequence $\Lambda = (\Delta,\Theta)$ is called the *bidirective sequence* of the word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$.

**Properties of the generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta) \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$:**

1. If $R$, resp. $E$ is contained in $\Theta$ infinitely many times, then the language of $\mathbf{u}$ is closed under reversal, resp. under the exchange antimorphism.

2. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is uniformly recurrent.

## 5.2 Normalization

In contrast to $E$- and $R$-standard words, the sequence $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ of prefixes of the generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$ does not have to contain all $E$- and $R$-palindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$. In [8] the notion of normalization of the bidirective sequence has been therefore introduced.

**Definition 10.** A bidirective sequence $\Lambda = (\Delta,\Theta)$ of a generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$ is called *normalized* if the sequence of prefixes $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$ contains all $E$- and $R$-palindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$.

**Example 11.** Let $\Lambda = (\Delta,\Theta) = ((011)^\omega,(EER)^\omega)$. Let us write down the first prefixes of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$:

$$w_1 = 01$$
$$w_2 = 011001$$
$$w_3 = 01100110.$$

The sequence $w_k$ does not contain for instance the $R$-palindromic prefixes 0 and 0110 of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$.

In [8] it has been proven that every bidirective sequence $\Lambda$ can be normalized, i.e. transformed to such a form $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ that the new sequence $(\widetilde{w_k})_{k\geqslant 0}$ contains already every $E$- and $R$-palindromic prefix and $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ generates the same generalized pseudostandard word as $\Lambda$.

**Theorem 12.** *Let $\Lambda = (\Delta, \Theta)$ be a bidirective sequence. Then there exists a normalized bidirective sequence $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (\widetilde{\Delta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$ such that $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta) = \mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Delta}, \widetilde{\Theta})$.*

*Moreover, in order to normalize the sequence $\Lambda$, it suffices firstly to execute the following changes of its prefix (if it is of the corresponding form):*

- $(a\bar{a}, RR) \to (a\bar{a}a, RER)$,
- $(a^i, R^{i-1}E) \to (a^i\bar{a}, R^iE)$ *for* $i \geqslant 1$,
- $(a^i\bar{a}\bar{a}, R^iEE) \to (a^i\bar{a}\bar{a}a, R^iERE)$ *for* $i \geqslant 1$,

*and secondly to replace step by step from left to right every factor of the form:*

- $(ab\bar{b}, \vartheta\overline{\vartheta\vartheta}) \to (ab\bar{b}b, \vartheta\overline{\vartheta}\vartheta\overline{\vartheta})$,

*where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\vartheta \in \{E, R\}$.*

**Example 13.** Let us normalize the bidirective sequence $\Lambda = ((011)^\omega, (EER)^\omega)$ from Example 11. According to the procedure from Theorem 12, we transform first the prefix of $\Lambda$. We replace $(0, E)$ with $(01, RE)$ and get $\Lambda_1 = (01(110)^\omega, RE(ERE)^\omega)$. The prefix of $\Lambda_1$ is still of a forbidden form, we replace thus the prefix $(011, REE)$ with $(0110, RERE)$ and get $\Lambda_2 = (0110(101)^\omega, RERE(REE)^\omega)$. The prefix of $\Lambda_2$ is now correct. It remains to replace from left to right the factors $(101, REE)$ with $(1010, RERE)$. Finally, we obtain $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (0110(1010)^\omega, RERE(RERE)^\omega) = (01(10)^\omega, (RE)^\omega)$, which is already normalized. Let us write down the first prefixes $(\widetilde{w_k})_{k\geqslant 0}$ of $\mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Lambda})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{w_1} &= 0\\
\widetilde{w_2} &= 01\\
\widetilde{w_3} &= 0110\\
\widetilde{w_4} &= 011001.
\end{aligned}$$

We can notice that the new sequence $(\widetilde{w_k})_{k\geqslant 0}$ contains now even the palindromes 0 and 0110 that were skipped in Example 11.

# 6 Periodicity of generalized pseudostandard words

Our first new result concerning generalized pseudostandard words is a necessary and sufficient condition for their periodicity.

**Theorem 14.** *A generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$, where $\Delta = \delta_1\delta_2\ldots \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\Theta = \vartheta_1\vartheta_2\ldots \in \{E, R\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, is periodic if and only if the bidirective sequence $(\Delta, \Theta)$ satisfies the following condition:*

$$(\exists a \in \{0, 1\})(\exists \vartheta \in \{E, R\})(\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N})(\forall n > n_0, n \in \mathbb{N})(\delta_{n+1} = a \Leftrightarrow \vartheta_n = \vartheta). \qquad (2)$$

Let us point out that generalized pseudostandard words are either aperiodic or purely periodic – it follows from the fact that they are recurrent.

In order to prove Theorem 14 we need the following lemma and observation.

**Lemma 15.** *Let $(\Delta, \Theta)$ be a normalized bidirective sequence of a generalized pseudostandard word. Assume $(\Delta, \Theta)$ satisfies the condition (2) and both $E$ and $R$ occur in $\Theta$ infinitely many times. Then there exist*

$$\nu \in \{0,1\}^*,\ \theta \in \{E,R\}^*,\ a,b \in \{0,1\},\ \vartheta \in \{E,R\},\ i \in \mathbb{N}$$

*such that it holds:*

$$\Delta = \nu b a^i (a\bar{a})^\omega \quad \textit{and} \quad \Theta = \theta \vartheta^{i+1} (\overline{\vartheta}\vartheta)^\omega \quad \textit{and } |\nu| = |\theta|.$$

*Proof.* Let us set $\nu = \delta_1 \dots \delta_{n_0}$ and $\theta = \vartheta_1 \cdots \vartheta_{n_0}$. Let us further denote $b = \delta_{n_0+1}$ and $\vartheta = \vartheta_{n_0+1}$. Since the bidirective sequence satisfies the condition (2), the same letter – say $a$ – has to follow $\vartheta$. Since both $E$ and $R$ occur in $\Theta$ infinitely many times, $\vartheta$ is repeated only finitely many times – say $i+1$ times, i.e. $\vartheta_{n_0+1} = \ldots = \vartheta_{n_0+1+i} = \vartheta$ and $\vartheta_{n_0+2+i} = \overline{\vartheta}$. According to (2) we have $\delta_{n_0+2} = \ldots = \delta_{n_0+2+i} = a$ and $\delta_{n_0+3+i} = \bar{a}$. By Theorem 12 a normalized bidirective sequence cannot contain the factor $(cd\bar{d}, \gamma\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma})$ for any $c, d \in \{0,1\}$, $\gamma \in \{E,R\}$. Consequently, $\vartheta_{n_0+3+i} = \vartheta$. Consider now the prefix of $(\Delta, \Theta)$ of the form $\Lambda_k = (\nu b a^i (a\bar{a})^k, \theta \vartheta^{i+1} (\overline{\vartheta}\vartheta)^k)$. Then again by Theorem 12 and using (2), the prefix of $(\Delta, \Theta)$ of length $|\Lambda_k| + 2$ is equal to $\Lambda_{k+1}$. □

The following observation follows easily from Theorem 12.

**Observation 16.** *Let a bidirective sequence of a generalized pseudostandard word satisfy the condition (2). Then its normalization keeps the condition (2) valid.*

*Proof of Theorem 14.* $(\Leftarrow)$ :

1. Assume that the bidirective sequence $\Lambda = (\Delta, \Theta)$ contains both $E$ and $R$ infinitely many times. Let us normalize $\Lambda$ and denote the new bidirective sequence $\widetilde{\Lambda}$. By Observation 16 the sequence $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ fulfills the condition (2). Applying Lemma 15 it is possible to write $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (\widetilde{\nu}(a\bar{a})^\omega, \widetilde{\theta}(\overline{\vartheta}\vartheta)^\omega)$, where $|\widetilde{\nu}| = |\widetilde{\theta}|$. Without loss of generality suppose that $\widetilde{\theta} = \widetilde{\theta_1}\vartheta$. (Otherwise we would extend the sequence $\widetilde{\nu}$ and $\widetilde{\theta}$ by two consecutive members.) Set $n_0 = |\widetilde{\theta}|$. We will show that for all $n > n_0$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that either

$$w_n = w_{n_0}[(w_{n_0}^{-1} w_{n_0+1}) \vartheta \overline{\vartheta} (w_{n_0}^{-1} w_{n_0+1})]^k, \tag{3}$$

or

$$w_n = w_{n_0}[(w_{n_0}^{-1} w_{n_0+1}) \vartheta \overline{\vartheta} (w_{n_0}^{-1} w_{n_0+1})]^k (w_{n_0}^{-1} w_{n_0+1}), \tag{4}$$

where $(w_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ is the sequence of prefixes associated with $\mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Lambda})$ (we omit tildes for simplicity). It follows then directly from these forms that

$$w_{n_0+1}\vartheta\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})w_{n_0}^{-1} \tag{5}$$

is the period of the generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta,\Theta)$.

It is not difficult to show that if $w_n$ is of the form (3), then $w_n = \vartheta(w_n)$. It suffices to take into account that $\vartheta_{n_0} = \vartheta$ and therefore $\vartheta(w_{n_0}) = w_{n_0}$ and $\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0+1}) = w_{n_0+1}$. Similarly, if $w_n$ is of the form (4), then $w_n = \overline{\vartheta}(w_n)$.

Let us proceed by induction: $w_{n_0}$ and $w_{n_0+1}$ are of the form (3) or (4) – it suffices to set $k$ equal to 0. Let $n > n_0 + 1$ and assume $w_\ell$ is of the form (3) or (4) for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, where $n_0 + 1 < \ell \leqslant n$.

- Let $w_n$ be of the form (3). Then $w_n = \vartheta(w_n)$ and thanks to the condition (2) it holds $\delta_{n+1} = a$. When constructing $w_{n+1}$, we search for the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic suffix of $w_n a$. Since $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is normalized, the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic prefix of $w_n$ is $w_{n-1}$, and consequently the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic suffix of $w_n$ is $\vartheta(w_{n-1})$. Thanks to the form of $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (\widetilde{\nu}(a\bar{a})^\omega, \widetilde{\theta(\vartheta}\vartheta)^\omega)$ we further know that $w_{n-1}$ is followed by $\bar{a}$. Since $w_n$ is a $\vartheta$-palindrome, the factor $\vartheta(w_{n-1})$ is preceded by $\vartheta(\bar{a})$. Consequently, $\vartheta(\bar{a})\vartheta(w_{n-1})a$ is a candidate for the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic suffix of $w_n a$. On the one hand, if $\vartheta = R$, this candidate equals $\bar{a}R(w_{n-1})a$, which is an $E$-palindrome. On the other hand, if $\vartheta = E$, then this candidate equals $aE(w_{n-1})a$, which is an $R$-palindrome. Thus it is indeed the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic suffix of $w_n a$. Using the induction assumption and since $w_{n-1}$ is a $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindrome, we have:

$$w_n = w_{n_0}[(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})\vartheta\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})]^k,$$

$$w_{n-1} = w_{n_0}[(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})\vartheta\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})]^{k-1}(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1}).$$

  Consequently, we obtain:

$$w_{n+1} = (w_n a)^{\overline{\vartheta}} = (w_{n_0+1}\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0}^{-1})\vartheta(w_{n-1})a)^{\overline{\vartheta}} = w_n(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1}).$$

  It correspond to the form (4).
- For $w_n$ of the form (4) we proceed analogously.

2. Let the bidirective sequence be of the form $\Lambda = (\nu a^\omega, \theta\vartheta^\omega)$. (In fact, the generalized pseudostandard word in question is either an $E$-standard or an $R$-standard word with seed.) It is known in this case that the word is periodic [1]. Let us rewrite the bidirective sequence so that $|\nu| = |\theta|$ and $\theta = \theta_1\vartheta$. Denote $n_0 = |\theta|$. It can be proven similarly as in the first case that for all $n > n_0$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$w_n = w_{n_0}[w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1}]^k. \tag{6}$$

Therefore the period of the $E$- or $R$-standard word with seed in question is equal to $w_{n_0+1}w_{n_0}^{-1}$.

($\Rightarrow$) : We will show that if the condition (2) is not satisfied, then the generalized pseudo-standard word $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$ is aperiodic. More precisely, we will show that each of its prefixes is a left special factor. Let us restrict ourselves to the case where $\Theta$ contains $E$ and $R$ infinitely many times. Otherwise, we deal with $E$- or $R$-standard words with seed and the result is known from [1]. The negation of the condition (2) reads: for all $a \in \{0, 1\}$, for all $\vartheta \in \{E, R\}$, and for all $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n > n_0$ such that

$$(\delta_{n+1} = a \wedge \vartheta_n = \overline{\vartheta}) \vee (\delta_{n+1} = \bar{a} \wedge \vartheta_n = \vartheta). \tag{7}$$

Let $v$ be a prefix of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$. At first, take $a = 0$, $\vartheta = R$, and $n_0 > |v|$, then there exists $n_1 > n_0$ such that $(\delta_{n_1+1} = 0 \wedge \vartheta_{n_1} = E) \vee (\delta_{n_1+1} = 1 \wedge \vartheta_{n_1} = R)$. At second, choose $a = 1$, $\vartheta = R$, and $n_0 > |v|$, then there exists $n_2 > n_0$ such that $(\delta_{n_2+1} = 1 \wedge \vartheta_{n_2} = E) \vee (\delta_{n_2+1} = 0 \wedge \vartheta_{n_2} = R)$. The following four cases may occur:

- $\delta_{n_1+1} = 0$, $\vartheta_{n_1} = E$ and $\delta_{n_2+1} = 1$, $\vartheta_{n_2} = E$: In this case, both $w_{n_1}$ and $w_{n_2}$ are $E$-palindromes, thus $E(v)$ is a suffix of both of them. Since $\delta_{n_1+1} = 0$ and $\delta_{n_2+1} = 1$, the words $E(v)0$ and $E(v)1$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$. Thanks to the closeness of the language under $E$, both $1v$ and $0v$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$.

- $\delta_{n_1+1} = 0$, $\vartheta_{n_1} = E$ and $\delta_{n_2+1} = 0$, $\vartheta_{n_2} = R$: Now, $E(v)$ has the right extension $E(v)0$ and $R(v)$ has the right extension $R(v)0$. Using the closeness of the language under $E$ and $R$, one can see that both $1v$ and $0v$ are factors of $\mathbf{u}(\Delta, \Theta)$.

- $\delta_{n_1+1} = 1$, $\vartheta_{n_1} = R$ and $\delta_{n_2+1} = 1$, $\vartheta_{n_2} = E$: This case is analogous to the previous one.

- $\delta_{n_1+1} = 1$, $\vartheta_{n_1} = R$ and $\delta_{n_2+1} = 0$, $\vartheta_{n_2} = R$: This case is similar to the first one.

□

**Example 17.** Consider the bidirective sequence $\Lambda = ((011)^\omega, (EER)^\omega)$ from Example 11. This sequence satisfies the condition (2). According to Observation 16 the normalization of the bidirective sequence preserves the condition (2). It follows from Example 13 that the normalized form of the bidirective sequence is $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (01(10)^\omega, RE(RE)^\omega)$. Let us write down the first prefixes $\widetilde{w_k}$ of $\mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Lambda})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{w_1} &= 0 \\
\widetilde{w_2} &= 01 \\
\widetilde{w_3} &= 0110 \\
\widetilde{w_4} &= 011001 \\
\widetilde{w_5} &= 01100110 \\
\widetilde{w_6} &= 0110011001.
\end{aligned}$$

In the proof of Theorem 14, the formula for the period (not necessarily the smallest one) of $\mathbf{u}(\Lambda)$ was given (5):

$$w_{n_0+1}\vartheta\overline{\vartheta}(w_{n_0}^{-1}w_{n_0+1})w_{n_0}^{-1},$$

where $\vartheta = E$, $n_0 = 2$, $w_{n_0} = \widetilde{w_2}$, and $w_{n_0+1} = \widetilde{w_3}$. Thus the period equals $0110 = \widetilde{w_3}$. Therefore $\mathbf{u}(\Lambda) = \mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Lambda}) = (0110)^\omega$.

# 7 Conjecture 4n

Our second result is a counterexample to Conjecture $4n$ (Conjecture 43 stated in [8]):

**Conjecture 18** (Conjecture 4n)**.** For every binary generalized pseudostandard word $\mathbf{u}$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{u}(n) \leqslant 4n$ for all $n > n_0$.

We have found a counterexample $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ that satisfies $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}_p}(n) > 4n$ for all $n \geqslant 10$. Let us write down its first prefixes $w_n$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
w_1 &= 10\\
w_2 &= 1010\\
w_3 &= 10101\\
w_4 &= 1010110101\\
w_5 &= 101011010110010100 1010\\
w_6 &= 10101101011001010010101101011001010010 10
\end{aligned}
$$

It is readily seen that $w_{4k+1}$ and $w_{4k+2}$ are $E$-palindromes, while $w_{4k+3}$ and $w_{4k+4}$ are $R$-palindromes for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The aim of this section will be hence to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 19.** *The infinite word* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ *satisfies*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}_p}(n) > 4n \quad \textit{for all } n \geqslant 10.$$

In order to prove Theorem 19, we have to describe all weak bispecial factors and find enough strong bispecial factors so that it provides us with a lower bound on the second difference of complexity (see the formula (1)) that leads to the strict lower bound equal to $4n$ on the complexity of $\mathbf{u}_p$. The partial steps will be formulated in several lemmas and observations.

Let us start with description of the relation between the consecutive prefixes $w_k$ and $w_{k+1}$ that will turn out to be useful in many proofs. The knowledge of the normalized form of the bidirective sequence is needed.

**Observation 20.** *The normalized form of the bidirective sequence* $\Lambda = (1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ *is* $\widetilde{\Lambda} = (1010(1)^\omega, RERE(RREE)^\omega)$.

*Proof.* The normalized form is obtained using the algorithm from Theorem 12. □

**Example 21.** The prefixes $\widetilde{w_n}$ of $\mathbf{u}(\widetilde{\Lambda})$ satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{w_1} &= 1\\
\widetilde{w_2} &= 10\\
\widetilde{w_3} &= 101\\
\widetilde{w_n} &= w_{n-2} \quad \text{for all } n \geqslant 4.
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 22.** *For the infinite word* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *the following relations hold. For* $z \leqslant 0$ *we set* $w_z = \varepsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{4k+1} &= w_{4k}10E(w_{4k})\\
w_{4k+2} &= w_{4k+1}w_{4k-2}^{-1}w_{4k+1}\\
w_{4k+3} &= w_{4k+2}(010)^{-1}R(w_{4k+2})\\
w_{4k+4} &= w_{4k+3}w_{4k}^{-1}w_{4k+3}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* One can easily check that the statement holds for $w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$ and $w_4$. Let $k \geqslant 1$.

- In order to get the $E$-palindrome $w_{4k+1}$, it is necessary to find the longest $E$-palindromic suffix of $w_{4k}1$. In other words, it it necessary to find the longest $E$-palindromic suffix preceded by 0 of the $R$-palindrome $w_{4k}$. Taking into account the normalized form of the bidirective sequence $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ from Observation 20, for every $E$-palindromic, resp. $R$-palindromic prefix $p$ of $\mathbf{u_p}$ there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p = \widetilde{w_\ell}$. Therefore all $E$-palindromic suffixes of $w_{4k}$ are of the form $R(\widetilde{w_\ell})$, where $\widetilde{w_\ell} = E(\widetilde{w_\ell})$. We however search only for the longest $E$-palindromic suffix of $w_{4k}$ preceded by 0. If $0R(\widetilde{w_\ell})$ is a suffix of $w_{4k}$, then $\widetilde{w_\ell}0$ has to be the prefix of $w_{4k}$. Using the normalized form $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ we nevertheless notice that no $\widetilde{w_\ell} = E(\widetilde{w_\ell})$ is followed by 0. Consequently, $w_{4k+1} = w_{4k}10E(w_{4k})$.

- To obtain the $E$-palindrome $w_{4k+2}$, we look for the longest $E$-palindromic suffix of the $E$-palindrome $w_{4k+1}$ preceded by 0. We proceed analogously as in the previous case, thus we search for the longest $E$-palindromic prefix $\widetilde{w_\ell}$ of $w_{4k+1}$ followed by 1. Then $E(\widetilde{w_\ell}1) = 0\widetilde{w_\ell}$ is the longest $E$-palindromic suffix of $w_{4k+1}$ preceded by 0. It follows from the form of $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ that every $E$-palindromic prefix $\widetilde{w_\ell}$ of $w_{4k+1}$ is followed by 1. Moreover, according to Example 21, $E$-palindromes in the sequence $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ coincide with $E$-palindromes in the sequence $(\widetilde{w_k})_{k\geqslant 0}$, therefore the longest $E$-palindromic prefix $\widetilde{w_\ell}$ of $w_{4k+1}$ followed by 1 is $w_{4k-2}$. Consequently, $w_{4k+2} = w_{4k+1}w_{4k-2}^{-1}w_{4k+1}$.

- The remaining two cases are similar. They are left as an exercise for the reader.

□

It is not difficult to find strong bispecials among members of the sequence $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$.

**Lemma 23.** *Consider* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ *and let* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then* $w_{4k+1}$ *and* $w_{4k+3}$ *are strong bispecials of* $\mathbf{u}_p$. *Moreover,* $1w_{4k+1}0$ *is a central factor of* $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ *and* $0w_{4k+3}0$ *is a central factor of* $w_{4(k+1)+3}$.

*Proof.* Let us show the statement for the $E$-palindrome $w_{4k+1}$. The proof for the $R$-palindrome $w_{4k+3}$ is similar.

Since $\Delta = 1^\omega$, the prefix $w_{4k+1}$ is followed by 1. Consider now any $E$-palindrome $w_j$ such that $j > 4k+1$. Since $w_j = E(w_j)$ and $w_{4k+1}1$ is a prefix of $w_j$, the factor $0E(w_{4k+1}) = 0w_{4k+1}$ is a suffix of $w_j$. The prefix $w_j$ is again followed by 1, therefore $0w_{4k+1}1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u_p})$. Consider further on any $R$-palindrome $w_\ell$ such that $\ell > 4k+1$. Since $w_{4k+1}1$ is again a prefix of $w_\ell = R(w_\ell)$, the factor $1R(w_{4k+1})$ is a suffix of $w_\ell$. The prefix $w_\ell$ is followed by 1, thus $1R(w_{4k+1})1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u_p})$. Thanks to the closeness of the language under $R$ and $E$, we deduce that $1w_{4k+1}1, 0w_{4k+1}0 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u_p})$.

Let us find the missing extension $1w_{4k+1}0$ of the $E$-palindrome $w_{4k+1}$. We will show that $1w_{4k+1}0$ is a central factor of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$. By Lemma 22 we have

$$w_{4(k+1)+1} = w_{4(k+1)}10E(w_{4(k+1)}).$$

The factor $w_{4k}1$ is a prefix of the $R$-palindrome $w_{4(k+1)}$, therefore $1R(w_{4k}) = 1w_{4k}$ is a suffix of $w_{4(k+1)}$. It implies moreover that $E(1w_{4k}) = E(w_{4k})0$ is a prefix of $E(w_{4(k+1)})$. Altogether we obtain that

$$1w_{4k+1}0 = 1w_{4k}10E(w_{4k})0$$

is a central factor of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$. □

Let us indicate how we managed to find weak bispecials. The factor $w_k$ has $w_{k-1}1$ as prefix. When constructing $w_k = \vartheta(w_k)$, one looks for the longest $\vartheta$-palindromic suffix of $w_{k-1}1$. In order to get a weak bispecial, we look instead for the longest $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindromic suffix of $w_{k-1}1$. If this suffix is longer than the longest $\vartheta$-palindromic suffix, we look whether its extension is as well a $\overline{\vartheta}$-palindrome. If yes, we extend it and continue in the same way. When we arrive at the moment where it is not possible to extend it any more, we have a bispecial factor: We get either a factor of the form $ap\overline{a}$, where $p = R(p)$, and thanks to the closeness of the language under reversal, $\overline{a}pa$ is a factor of $\mathbf{u}_p$, too. Or we get a factor of the form $apa$, where $p = E(p)$, and thanks to the closeness of the language under the exchange antimorphism, $\overline{a}p\overline{a}$ is a factor of $\mathbf{u}_p$, too.

**Lemma 24.** *Consider* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. *Then for all* $k \in \mathbb{N},\ k \geqslant 1$, *the following factors of* $\mathbf{u}_p$ *are bispecials:*

$$s_{4k+1} = R(w_{4(k-1)+1})w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+1},$$

$$s_{4k+3} = E(w_{4(k-1)+3})w_{4k-2}^{-1}w_{4k+1}w_{4k-2}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}.$$

*Moreover, the* $R$*-palindrome* $s_{4k+1}$ *is contained in the prefix* $w_{4k+1}$ *and has the extensions* $1s_{4k+1}0$ *and* $0s_{4k+1}1$, *and the* $E$*-palindrome* $s_{4k+3}$ *is contained in the prefix* $w_{4k+3}$ *and has the extensions* $0s_{4k+3}0$ *a* $1s_{4k+3}1$.

*Proof.* Let us show the statement for $s_{4k+1}$. The proof for $s_{4k+3}$ is similar. Using Lemma 22 we can write $w_{4k+1} = w_{4k}10E(w_{4k})$. The prefix $w_{4k}$ and the suffix $E(w_{4k})$ can be again rewritten as follows:

$$w_{4k+1} = w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}10E(w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}).$$

Thus $w_{4k+1}$ has $w_{4(k-1)+3}$ as prefix. The factor $w_{4(k-1)+3}$ has certainly $w_{4(k-1)+1}1$ as prefix. Since the factor $w_{4(k-1)+3}$ is an $R$-palindrome, the factor $1R(w_{4(k-1)+1})$ is its suffix. Using the above form of $w_{4k+1}$, we can see that the word $1R(w_{4(k-1)+1})w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}$ is a factor of $w_{4k+1}$.

Thanks to Lemma 23 we know that $1w_{4(k-1)+1}0$ is a central factor of $w_{4k+1}$. Let us use again Lemma 22 to rewrite $w_{4(k-1)+1}$:

$$w_{4(k-1)+1} = w_{4(k-1)}10E(w_{4(k-1)}).$$

The already constructed factor $1R(w_{4(k-1)+1})w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}$ is therefore followed by $w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+1}0$. Consequently, we get the following factor of $w_{4k+1}$:

$$1R(w_{4(k-1)+1})w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+1}0.$$

Hence, $s_{4k+1} = R(w_{4(k-1)+1})w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+1}$ is contained in $w_{4k+1}$ and it is easy to check that $s_{4k+1}$ is an $R$-palindrome. We have so far found its extension $1s_{4k+1}0$. Using the closeness of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u_p})$ under reversal, it follows that $0s_{4k+1}1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u_p})$. □

**Example 25.** Let us write down the shortest two bispecials $s_\ell$:

$$s_5 = 011010110,$$

$$s_7 = 010101101011001010010101.$$

**Proposition 26.** *The factors $s_{4k+1}$ and $s_{4k+3}$ are weak bispecials for all $k \geqslant 1$. Moreover, there are no other weak bispecials in the language of $\mathbf{u}_p$ except for $s_{4k+1}$, $s_{4k+3}$ and their $R$- and $E$-images.*

Let us postpone the proof of Proposition 26 to a separate subsection since it is long and technical, and provide instead the remaining steps to the proof of Theorem 19.

In order to estimate the second difference of complexity, we need to determine the relation of lengths of weak and strong bispecials.

**Observation 27.** *Consider $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geqslant 1$. Then*

$$|s_{4k+1}| < |w_{4k+1}| < |s_{4k+3}| < |w_{4k+3}| < |s_{4(k+1)+1}|.$$

**Observation 28.** *Consider $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds:*

$$\Delta^2\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u_p}}(n) \geqslant \begin{cases} 2, & n \in \{|w_{4k+1}|, |w_{4k+3}|\}, \\ -2, & n \in \{|s_{4k+1}|, |s_{4k+3}|\}, \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We use the formula (1). For $n \in \{|w_{4k+1}|, |w_{4k+3}|\}$ we have at least two strong bispecials of $\mathbf{u_p}$: $w_{4k+1}$ and $R(w_{4k+1})$, resp. $w_{4k+3}$ and $E(w_{4k+3})$ by Lemma 23. For $n \in \{|s_{4k+1}|, |s_{4k+3}|\}$ we have exactly two weak bispecials of $\mathbf{u_p}$: $s_{4k+1}$ and $E(s_{4k+1})$, resp. $s_{4k+3}$ and $R(s_{4k+3})$ by Proposition 26. Moreover, Proposition 26 states that all other bispecials have at least three extensions. □

**Lemma 29.** *Consider $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. Let $k \geqslant 5$. Then $w_k$ contains all factors of $\mathbf{u_p}$ of length less than or equal to $|w_{k-5}|$, but possibly the images by the antimorphisms $E$ and $R$, and the morphism $ER$. Further on, $w_{k+2}$ contains all factors of $\mathbf{u_p}$ of length less than or equal to $|w_{k-5}|$.*

*Proof.* We will prove the first statement. The second one is its direct consequence – it suffices to take into account the form of the bidirective sequence. We will show that $w_s$ for $s \geqslant k \geqslant 5$ does not contain except for $E$-, $R$- and $ER$-images other factors of length less than or equal to $|w_{k-5}|$ than those ones that are contained in $w_k$. For contradiction assume that $v$ is the first such factor and that $s$ is the smallest index such that $v$ is contained in $w_s$.

- If $s = 4\ell$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}w_{s-4}^{-1}w_{s-1}$. The factor $v$ has to contain the central factor $1w_{s-4}1$ of $w_s$ (otherwise $v$ would be contained already in $w_{s-1}$), which is a contradiction because $|1w_{s-4}1| > |v|$.
- If $s = 4\ell+1$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}10E(w_{s-1})$. The factor $w_{s-4}$ is a central factor of $w_s$ and it has to contain the factor $v$ since $v$ is either a suffix of $w_{s-1}1$ or a prefix of $0E(w_{s-1})$ or $v$ contains the central factor 10 (otherwise, $v$ or $E(v)$ would be contained already in $w_{s-1}$). It is however a contradiction with the minimality of the index $s$.
- The remaining two cases are analogous.

□

*Proof of Theorem 19.* Using the program Sage [11] we have seen that the prefix $\mathbf{u_p}$ of length 20000 satisfies $\mathcal{C}(10) = 42$ and $\Delta\mathcal{C}(9) = 6$. It follows from Lemma 29 that the previous equalities hold for the complexity of the whole infinite word $\mathbf{u_p}$. (Since $|w_4| = 10$, all factors of length 10 are, according to Lemma 29, contained in the prefix $w_{11}$ of length 1077.) It remains to verify for all $n \geqslant 10$ that $\Delta\mathcal{C}(n) \geqslant 4$. This follows from the facts that $|s_5| = 9$ and $|w_5| = 22$ using the relation for the second difference of complexity (1) and Observations 27 and 28. □

## 7.1 Proof of Proposition 26

This section is devoted to quite a long and technical proof of the fact that the only weak bispecials of $\mathbf{u_p}$ are $s_{4k+1}$ and $s_{4k+3}$ and their $E$- and $R$-images for all $k \in \mathbb{N},\ k \geqslant 1$. We will put together several lemmas and observations to get finally the proof.

**Lemma 30.** *Let $v$ be a prefix of $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. If $v$ is a bispecial, then $v$ has at least three extensions and $E(v), R(v), ER(v)$ has at least three extensions, too.*

*Proof.* Denote $a$ the letter for which $va$ is a prefix of $\mathbf{u_p}$. We can certainly find $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $va$ is a prefix of $w_k = R(w_k)$ and $w_\ell = E(w_\ell)$. Then $aR(v)$ is a suffix of $w_k$ and $\overline{a}E(v)$ is a suffix of $w_\ell$. By the construction of $\mathbf{u_p}$, the words $aR(v)1$ and $\overline{a}E(v)1$ belong to the language of $\mathbf{u_p}$. Its closeness under $E$ and $R$ implies that $1va$ and $0va$ are factors of $\mathbf{u_p}$, too. Since $v$ is a bispecial, $v$ has to have an extension $bv\overline{a}$ for some $b \in \{0,1\}$. Hence, $v$ has at least three extensions. The rest of the proof follows by application of the antimorphisms $E, R$ and the morphism $ER$. □

In order to detect all weak bispecial factors, we need to describe all occurrences of $w_k = \vartheta(w_k)$ and $\overline{\vartheta}(w_k)$. We will distinguish between regular and irregular occurrences.

**Definition 31.** Let $v$ be a factor of $\mathbf{u_p}$. We call *an image of* $v$ every element of $\{v, E(v), R(v), ER(v)\}$. Let us define *occurrences (of the images of $v$) generated by the particular occurrence* $i$ of $v$. Let $k$ be the minimal index such that $w_k$ contains the factor $v$ at the occurrence $i$. Since $w_k$ is a $\vartheta$-palindrome, it contains $\vartheta(v)$ symmetrically with respect to the center of $w_k$. If the corresponding occurrence $j$ of $\vartheta(v)$ is larger than $i$, we say that the occurrence $j$ is generated by the occurrence $i$ of $v$. Assume $w_\ell$ contains occurrences $i_1, \ldots, i_s$ of the images of $v$ generated by the particular occurrence $i$ of $v$. In order to get all occurrences of the images of $v$ generated by the particular occurrence $i$ of $v$ in $w_{\ell+1}$, we proceed in the following way. The prefix $w_{\ell+1}$ is a $\vartheta$-palindrome for some $\vartheta \in \{E, R\}$, and therefore contains symmetrically with respect to its center occurrences $j_1, \ldots, j_s$ of $v_1, \ldots, v_s$ that are $\vartheta$-images of images of $v$ at the occurrences $i_1, \ldots, i_s$. Putting all occurrences $i_1, \ldots, i_s, j_1, \ldots j_s$ together, we obtain all occurrences generated by the particular occurrence $i$ of $v$ in $w_{\ell+1}$.

We say that an occurrence of $v$ is *regular* if it is generated by the very first occurrence of any image of $v$ in $\mathbf{u_p}$. Otherwise, we call the occurrence of $v$ *irregular*.

**Example 32.** Consider $v = 110$. Its images are: $110, 100, 011, 001$. The first occurrence of an image of $v$ is $i = 3$ of $011$ in the $R$-palindrome $w_4 = 101\underline{011}0101$. Hence, the occurrence $i = 4$ of $v = 110$ in $w_4 = 1010\underline{110}101$ is regular. (It is the $R$-image of $011$ in $w_4$.) However, for instance the occurrence $i = 9$ of $v = 110$ in the $E$-palindrome $w_5 = 10101101011100101001010$ is irregular. (It is not the $E$-image of any image of $v$ at a regular occurrence in $w_4$.)

**Observation 33.** *Let $v$ be a factor of $\mathbf{u_p}$. Then $v$ has only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$ if and only if any element of $\{v, E(v), R(v), ER(v)\}$ has only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$.*

**Lemma 34.** *Consider $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume the factors $w_{4k}$ and $w_{4k+2}$ have only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$. Then the following statements hold:*

- *All irregular occurrences of the factor $1w_{4k}1$ in $\mathbf{u_p}$ are generated by its occurrences as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4\ell}1$ for all $\ell > k$. Moreover, the first regular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$ is as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4(k+1)}$.*
- *All irregular occurrences of the factor $0w_{4k+2}1$ in $\mathbf{u_p}$ are generated by its occurrences as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4\ell+2}1$ for all $\ell > k$. Moreover, the first regular occurrence of $0w_{4k+2}1$ is as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4(k+1)+2}$.*

- *All irregular occurrences of the factor* $1w_{4k+1}0$ *in* $\mathbf{u_p}$ *are generated by its occurrences as the central factor of the prefix* $w_{4\ell+1}$ *for all* $\ell > k+1$*. Moreover, the first regular occurrence of* $1w_{4k+1}0$ *is as the central factor of the prefix* $w_{4(k+1)+1}$*.*

- *All irregular occurrences of the factor* $0w_{4k+3}0$ *in* $\mathbf{u_p}$ *are generated by its occurrences as the central factor of the prefix* $w_{4\ell+3}$ *for all* $\ell > k+1$*. Moreover, the first regular occurrence of* $0w_{4k+3}0$ *is as the central factor of the prefix* $w_{4(k+1)+3}$*.*

*Proof.*

1. Let us show the statement for $1w_{4k}1$. The statement for $0w_{4k+2}1$ is an analogy, we leave it thus for the reader. Using Lemma 22 we know that $w_{4(k+1)} = w_{4k+3}w_{4k}^{-1}w_{4k+3}$. It is easy to see that the extension of the central factor $w_{4k}$ is $1w_{4k}1$. This extension occurs in $w_{4(k+1)}$ exactly once. Let us explain why: The factor $w_{4k}$ has only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$, therefore $w_{4k+1}$ contains $w_{4k}1$ as prefix and $0E(w_{4k})$ as suffix. Further on, $w_{4k+2}$ contains moreover $0E(w_{4k})1$ and $0w_{4k}1$, and $w_{4k+3}$ contains in addition $1E(w_{4k})0$ and $1w_{4k}0$. Consequently, $0E(w_{4k})0$ is not contained in $w_{4(k+1)}$ and the first occurrence $1w_{4k}1$ in $w_{4(k+1)}$ is necessarily regular.

   Let us study occurrences of $1w_{4k}1$ in the whole word $\mathbf{u_p}$. All regular occurrences of $1w_{4k}1$ are generated by the first occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$ as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4(k+1)}$. We will show that all irregular occurrences of $1w_{4k}1$ are generated by the occurrences of $1w_{4k}1$ as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4(l+1)}1$ for all $l \geqslant k$. It is evident that $1w_{4k}1$ is a suffix of the prefix $w_{4(l+1)}1$ and the factor $1w_{4k}1$ is here at an irregular occurrence.

   For the contradiction assume that $1w_{4k}1$ occurs at an irregular position that is not generated by the occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$ as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4(l+1)}1$ for any $l \geqslant k$. Such an irregular occurrence may be as well generated by an occurrence of $0E(w_{4k})0$. Let $w_s$ be the first prefix that contains such an irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$. Let $m \geqslant k+1$. If $s = 4m+1$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}10E(w_{s-1})$ and according to Lemma 23 the prefix $w_s$ has $1w_{4k+1}0$ as its central factor. The irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$ has to be contained in this factor. But $1w_{4k+1}0$ contains $1w_{4k}1$ only as a prefix and this occurrence corresponds at the same time to the suffix of $w_{4m}1$, which is a contradiction. If $s = 4m+2$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}w_{s-4}^{-1}w_{s-1}$ and the irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$ has to contain the central factor of $w_s$: $1w_{s-4}1$. However, $|1w_{s-4}1| > |1w_{4k}1| = |0E(w_{4k})0|$, which is a contradiction. Let $s = 4m+3$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}(010)^{-1}R(w_{s-1})$. Using Lemma 23 the prefix $w_s$ has $w_{4k+3}$ as its central factor. The irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$ has to contain the central factor of $w_s$: 10101. Consequently, $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$ has to be contained in $w_{4k+3}$, which is a contradiction. If $s = 4m+4$, then $w_s = w_{s-1}w_{s-4}^{-1}w_{s-1}$ and the irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$, resp. $0E(w_{4k})0$ has to contain the central factor of $w_s$: $1w_{s-4}1$. However, $|1w_{s-4}1| > |1w_{4k}1| = |0E(w_{4k})0|$, which is a contradiction.

3. Let us show the statement for $1w_{4k+1}0$. The fourth statement is its analogy. The first and thus regular occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$ is by Lemma 23 and by the assumption on regular occurrences of $w_{4k}$ as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4(k+1)+1}$.

Firstly, let us show that for all $\ell > k$ every occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ in the prefixes $w_{4\ell+2}, w_{4\ell+3}, w_{4\ell+4}$ is already generated by an occurrence of an image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in the prefix $w_{4\ell+1}$.

By Lemma 22 we can write $w_{4\ell+2} = w_{4\ell+1}w_{4\ell-2}^{-1}w_{\ell+1}$ and $0w_{4\ell-2}1$ is its central factor. If $w_{4\ell+2}$ contains an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ that is not generated by an occurrence of an image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in $w_{4\ell+1}$, then this occurrence has to contain $0w_{4\ell-2}1$. This is not possible because for all $\ell > k$ we have $|0w_{4\ell-2}1| > |1w_{4k+1}0| = |0R(w_{4k+1})1|$. Next, $w_{4\ell+3} = w_{4\ell+2}(010)^{-1}R(w_{4\ell+2})$. The central factor is 10101 and moreover from Lemma 23 we know that $w_{4k+3}$ is as well a central factor of $w_{4\ell+3}$. If $w_{4\ell+3}$ contains an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ that is not generated by an occurrence of an image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in $w_{4\ell+1}$, then this occurrence has to contain the factor 10101. Then such an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ is necessarily contained in $w_{4k+3}$. This is not possible since the factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ occurs for the first time in $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ and its $R$-image even later. Finally we have $w_{4\ell+4} = w_{4\ell+3}w_{4\ell}^{-1}w_{4\ell+3}$ and $1w_{4\ell}1$ is its central factor. If $w_{4\ell+4}$ contains an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ that is not generated by an occurrence of an image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in $w_{4\ell+1}$, then this occurrence has to contain the factor $1w_{4\ell}1$. This is again not possible because of lengths of those factors.

Secondly, let us show that the occurrence of the factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4\ell+1}$ is the only occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ in the prefix $w_{4\ell+1}$ that is not generated by any occurrence of an image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in the prefix $w_{4\ell}$. We have $w_{4\ell+1} = w_{4\ell}10E(w_{4\ell})$. Using Lemma 23 it follows that $1w_{4k+1}0$ is the central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$ and this occurrence is not generated by any image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ contained in $w_{4\ell}$. In order to have another occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ in the prefix $w_{4\ell+1}$ so that it is not generated by any image of $1w_{4k+1}0$ in the prefix $w_{4\ell}$, it has to be either a suffix of $w_{4\ell}1$ or a prefix of $0E(w_{4\ell})$ or it has to contain the central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$: 10. Then however such an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ has to be contained in the longer central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$: $w_{4(k+1)+1}$. This is not possible because $1w_{4k+1}0$ occurs in $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ exactly once as the central factor and this occurrence has been already discussed. Altogether we have described all occurrences of the factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ in $\mathbf{u_p}$. All irregular occurrences of $1w_{4k+1}0$ are thus generated by the occurrences of $1w_{4k+1}0$ as the central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$, $\ell > k+1$. □

**Lemma 35.** *Consider* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

1. *All occurrences of* $w_{4k}$ *and* $E(w_{4k})$ *are regular for* $k \geqslant 1$.
2. *All occurrences of* $w_{4k+2}$ *and* $R(w_{4k+2})$ *are regular.*
3. *All irregular occurrences of* $w_{4k+1}$ *and* $R(w_{4k+1})$ *are generated by the occurrences of* $w_{4k+1}$ *as the central factor of the prefixes* $w_{4\ell+1}$ *for all* $\ell > k$.
4. *All irregular occurrences of* $w_{4k+3}$ *and* $E(w_{4k+3})$ *are generated by the occurrences of* $w_{4k+3}$ *as the central factor of the prefixes* $w_{4\ell+3}$ *for all* $l > k$.

*Proof.* We will prove only the first and the third statement. The other statements are their analogy. Let us proceed by induction. Assume the first and the third statement hold for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

1. We will first prove that $w_{4(k+1)}$ has only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$. Putting together Lemma 34, the induction assumption and the fact that $1w_{4k}1$ and $w_{4(k+1)}$ are both $R$-palindromes, it follows that the occurrence of $w_{4(k+1)}$ is regular if and only if the occurrence of its central factor $1w_{4k}1$ is regular.

   Therefore the factor $w_{4(k+1)}$ at an irregular occurrence has to have as its central factor the factor $1w_{4k}1$ at an irregular occurrence, i.e. by Lemma 34 generated by an occurrence of $1w_{4k}1$ as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4\ell}1$ for some $\ell > k$. Assume $w_{4(k+1)}$ is at such an occurrence that its central factor $1w_{4k}1$ is the suffix of the prefix $w_{4\ell}1$. By Lemma 23 we know that $w_{4\ell+1} = w_{4\ell}10E(w_{4\ell})$ has the central factor $1w_{4k+1}0$. Therefore $w_{4(k+1)}$ having the suffix $1w_{4k}1$ of $w_{4\ell}1$ as its central factor has to contain $1w_{4k+1}0$. This is a contradiction because using Lemma 34 and the induction assumption, one can see that the factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ occurs for the first time in $w_{4(k+1)+1}$.

   By Observation 33 it follows that $E(w_{4(k+1)})$ has only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$, too.

   Let us conclude the proof for $k = 1$. We will show that $w_4$ and $E(w_4)$ have only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$. It is easy to check that $w_8$ contains only regular occurrences of $w_4$ and $E(w_4)$. See Appendix for the form of $w_8$. Assume $k > 8$ and $w_k$ contains the first irregular occurrence of $w_4$, resp. $E(w_4)$. For $k = 4m + 1$, we have $w_k = w_{k-1}10E(w_{k-1})$. By Lemma 23 the factor $w_5$ is a central factor of $w_k$, hence the irregular occurrence of $w_4$, resp. $E(w_4)$ has to be contained in $w_5$, which is a contradiction. If $k = 4m + 2$, then $w_k = w_{k-1}w_{k-4}^{-1}w_{k-1}$. The irregular occurrence of $w_4$, resp. $E(w_4)$ has to contain the central factor $0w_{k-4}1$, which is a contradiction. For $k = 4m + 3$, we have $w_k = w_{k-1}(010)^{-1}R(w_{k-1})$. The central factor of $w_k$ is $w_7$ by Lemma 23. Therefore the irregular occurrence of $w_4$, resp. $E(w_4)$ has to be contained in $w_7$, which is a contradiction. Finally for $k = 4m + 4$, the argument is similar as for $k = 4m + 2$. Consequently, $w_4$ and $E(w_4)$ have only regular occurrences in $\mathbf{u_p}$.

3. We will first prove that all irregular occurrences of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ are generated by its occurrences as the central factor of the prefixes $w_{4\ell+1}$ for all $l > k + 1$. Since by Lemma 34 and by the induction assumption, the factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ occurs for the first time as the central factor of the prefix $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ and since both $1w_{4k+1}0$ and $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ are $E$-palindromes and $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ does not contain $0R(w_{4k+1})1$, it follows that the occurrence of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ is regular if and only if the occurrence of its central factor $1w_{4k+1}0$ is regular.

   We will thus consider irregular occurrences of $1w_{4k+1}0$. We know using Lemma 34 and the induction assumption that every irregular occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$, resp. $0R(w_{4k+1})1$ is generated by an occurrence of $1w_{4k+1}0$ as the central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$ for $\ell > k + 1$. It is then a direct consequence that all irregular occurrences of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ are generated by the occurrences of $w_{4(k+1)+1}$ as the central factor of the prefixes $w_{4\ell+1}$ for all $\ell > k + 1$.

The statement for $R(w_{4(k+1)+1})$ follows using Observation 33.

It remains to prove the statement for $k = 0$. We have to show that all irregular occurrences of $w_1$ in $\mathbf{u_p}$ are generated by the occurrences of $w_1$ as the central factor of the prefixes $w_{4\ell+1}$ for all $\ell \geqslant 1$. It is easy to show that the first irregular occurrence of $w_1$ is the occurrence as the central factor of the prefix $w_5$. Let $m > 5$ and let $w_m$ contain the first irregular occurrence of $w_1$, resp. $R(w_1)$ that is not generated by the occurrence of $w_1$ as the central factor of the prefix $w_5$. If $m = 4\ell + 2$, then $w_m = w_{m-1}w_{m-4}^{-1}w_{m-1}$. Then the irregular occurrence of $w_1$, resp. $R(w_1)$ has to contain the central factor of $w_m$: $0w_{m-4}1$, which is not possible. If $m = 4\ell + 3$, then $w_m = w_{m-1}(010)^{-1}R(w_{m-1})$. By Lemma 23 the factor $w_3$ is a central factor of $w_m$. Then the irregular occurrence of $w_1$, resp. $R(w_1)$ has to be contained in $w_3$, which is a contradiction. If $m = 4\ell + 4$, then $w_m = w_{m-1}w_{m-4}^{-1}w_{m-1}$. Then the irregular occurrence of $w_1$, resp. $R(w_1)$ has to contain the central factor of $w_m$: $1w_{m-4}1$, which is not possible. If $m = 4\ell + 5$, then $w_m = w_{m-1}10E(w_{m-1})$. By Lemma 23 the factor $w_5$ is a central factor of $w_m$. Then the irregular occurrence of $w_1$, resp. $R(w_1)$ has to be contained in $w_5$. It follows that $w_1$ has to be the central factor of $w_{4\ell+5}$, $\ell \geqslant 1$.

□

In the proof of the last and essential lemma, we will make use of the following observation.

**Observation 36.** *Consider* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. *Denote for all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geqslant 1$*:*

$$p_{4k+1} = w_{4(k-1)+3}w_{4(k-1)}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+1},$$

$$p_{4k+3} = w_{4k+1}w_{4k-2}^{-1}w_{4(k-1)+3}.$$

*Then the factor* $p_{4k+1}$ *is a suffix of* $s_{4k+1}$ *and a prefix of* $w_{4k}$ *and similarly the factor* $p_{4k+3}$ *is a suffix of* $s_{4k+3}$ *and a prefix of* $w_{4k+2}$.

**Lemma 37.** *Let* $v$ *be a factor, but not an image of a prefix of* $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$. *The following statements hold:*

- *If* $v$ *is neither an E-palindrome, nor an R-palindrome, then* $v$ *is not a bispecial.*
- *If* $v$ *is an E-palindrome or an R-palindrome, but different from* $s_{4k+1}$, $E(s_{4k+1})$, $s_{4k+3}$, $R(s_{4k+3})$ *for all* $k \geqslant 1$, *then* $v$ *is either not a bispecial, or it is a bispecial with three extensions.*
- *If* $v$ *is equal to one of the bispecials* $s_{4k+1}$, $E(s_{4k+1})$, $s_{4k+3}$, $R(s_{4k+3})$ *for some* $k \geqslant 1$, *then* $v$ *is a weak bispecial.*

*Proof.* We will find the minimal index $k$ such that $w_k$ contains an image of the factor $v$. Let the first occurrence of an image of $v$ correspond without loss of generality to $v$. Let us discuss the possible cases.

No such factors are contained in $w_3$.

1. Let $k = 4\ell,\ \ell \geqslant 1$. We have $w_{4\ell} = w_{4(\ell-1)+3}w_{4\ell-4}^{-1}w_{4(\ell-1)+3}$. The extension of the central factor is $1w_{4\ell-4}1$. According to Lemma 34 the factor $1w_{4\ell-4}1$ occurs for the first time as the central factor of $w_{4\ell}$ and moreover $w_{4\ell}$ does not contain $0E(w_{4\ell-4})0$. Since $v$ is not contained in $w_{4(\ell-1)+3}$, the factor $v$ has to contain the central factor of $w_{4\ell}$: $1w_{4\ell-4}1$. Hence $v$ occurs once in $w_{4\ell}$. Let us denote $avb$ the corresponding extension of $v$, where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$. If $v$ is a $\vartheta$-palindrome, then thanks to the unique occurrence of the $R$-palindrome $1w_{4\ell-4}1$ and the absence of $0E(w_{4\ell-4})0$ in $w_{4\ell}$, the factor $v$ has to be the central $R$-palindrome of $w_{4\ell}$. In this case its extension is $ava$. Moreover, $v$ is distinct from $s_{4m+1}$ and $E(s_{4m+1})$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ because these $R$-palindromes do not have the central factor $1w_{4\ell-4}1$. Assume further without loss of generality that the extension of $v$ at its first occurrence is $avb$.

   We will now study irregular occurrences of $v$. It is not difficult to see that regular occurrences of $1w_{4\ell-4}1$ are factors of regular occurrences of $v$ and $R(v)$. Therefore we have to look at irregular occurrences of $1w_{4\ell-4}1$. The first such occurrence is as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4\ell}1$. Then $v$ cannot contain the central factor $1w_{4(l-1)+1}0$ of $w_{4\ell+1} = w_{4\ell}10E(w_{4\ell})$ since by Lemmas 34 and 35 the factor $1w_{4(l-1)+1}0$ occurs for the first time in $w_{4\ell+1}$ while $v$ occurs already in $w_{4\ell}$. Consequently and since $v$ contains $1w_{4\ell-4}1$ once, $v$ has to be contained in the suffix of $s_{4\ell+1}$: $p_{4\ell+1}$ defined in Observation 36. If $v$ is not a suffix of $p_{4\ell+1}$, then since $p_{4\ell+1}$ is a prefix of $w_{4\ell}$, we do not get any new extension of $v$. If $v$ is a suffix of $p_{4\ell+1}$ and thus of the bispecial $s_{4\ell+1}$, the word $\mathbf{u_p}$ contains the extension $av\overline{b}$, too. All other irregular occurrences of $1w_{4\ell-4}1$ are generated by its occurrences as the suffix of the prefix $w_{4m}1,\ m > \ell$. It is not difficult to see that such occurrences do not provide any new extension of $v$. Altogether we have found for $v$ that is not an $R$ palindrome the extension $avb$ and possibly $av\overline{b}$. Thus, such a factor $v$ is not bispecial. If $v$ is an $R$-palindrome, then its extension is either only $ava$ and it is not a bispecial, or its extensions are $ava, av\overline{a}$ and by the closeness of the language under reversal as well $\overline{a}va$. Therefore $v$ is a bispecial with three extensions.

2. Let $k = 4\ell+1,\ \ell \geqslant 1$. The factor $v$ occurs for the first time in $w_{4\ell+1} = w_{4\ell}10E(w_{4\ell})$. Therefore $v$ contains either the central factor $1w_{4(\ell-1)+1}0$ of $w_{4\ell+1}$ or $v$ has to contain at least the suffix $1w_{4(\ell-1)+3}1$ of $w_{4\ell}1$. If $v$ does not contain neither $1w_{4(\ell-1)+1}0$ nor $1w_{4(\ell-1)+3}1$, then $v$ itself is contained in $p_{4\ell+1}$ defined in Observation 36. However, $p_{4\ell+1}$ is a prefix of $w_{4\ell}$, therefore $v$ would be contained already in $w_{4\ell}$.

   If $v$ contains $1w_{4(\ell-1)+1}0$, then $v$ occurs in $w_{4\ell+1}$ once since $w_{4\ell+1}$ contains $1w_{4(\ell-1)+1}0$ only once by Lemmas 34 and 35. If $v$ contains $1w_{4(\ell-1)+3}1$, then $v$ occurs in $w_{4\ell+1}$ only once, too, as one can easily check using Lemma 35. Denote $avb$ the corresponding extension of $v$. If $v$ is a $\vartheta$-palindrome, then two cases are possible: If $v$ contains $1w_{4(\ell-1)+1}0$, then $v$ is an $E$-palindromic central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$. Then $v$ is not equal to $s_{4m+3}$ or $R(s_{4m+3})$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ because neither $s_{4m+3}$ nor $R(s_{4m+3})$ is a central factor of $w_{4\ell+1}$. The extension of $v$ is then $av\overline{a}$. If $v$ contains $1w_{4(\ell-1)+3}1$, then $v$ has to be an $R$-palindrome with the central factor $1w_{4(\ell-1)+3}1$. The longest such palindrome in $w_{4\ell+1}$ is $s_{4\ell+1}$. If $v = s_{4\ell+1}$, then its extension is $av\overline{a}$. If $v$ is a shorter

palindrome, i.e. a central factor of $s_{4\ell+1}$, then its extension is $ava$. Assume further without loss of generality that the extension of $v$ at its first occurrence is $avb$.

It is not difficult to see that no irregular occurrence of any image of $v$ is contained in $w_{4\ell+1}$. Consider irregular occurrences of images of $v$ first in $w_{4\ell+2} = w_{4\ell+1}w_{4\ell-2}^{-1}w_{4\ell+1}$. The first irregular occurrence of an image of $v$ has to contain the central factor $0w_{4\ell-2}1$ of $w_{4\ell+2}$, which is not possible because $0w_{4\ell-2}1$ occurs by Lemmas 34 and 35 for the first time in $w_{4\ell+2}$, and moreover $w_{4\ell+2}$ does not contain $1R(w_{4\ell-2})0$. Thus $w_{4\ell+2}$ does not contain any irregular occurrence of any image of $v$. Similarly, no irregular occurrence of an image $v$ is contained in $w_{4\ell+3} = w_{4\ell+2}(010)^{-1}R(w_{4\ell+2})$. The image of $v$ cannot contain the central factor $0w_{4(\ell-1)+3}0$ because this factor occurs for the first time in $w_{4\ell+3}$ and its $E$-image even later. The image of $v$ cannot contain the suffix $0w_{4\ell-2}1$ of $w_{4\ell+2}1$ because $0w_{4\ell-2}1$ occurs for the first time in $w_{4\ell+2}$ and its $R$-image even later. This implies however that the image of $v$ is contained in $p_{4\ell+3}$ defined in Observation 36. And since $p_{4\ell+3}$ is a prefix of $w_{4\ell+2}$, such occurrence of the image of $v$ is regular. Consider an image of $v$ has an irregular occurrence in $w_{4\ell+4}$. Then the image of $v$ has to contain its central factor $1w_{4\ell}1$, which occurs however for the first time in $w_{4\ell+4}$ and its $E$-image even later. Therefore it is not possible. No new irregular occurrences can appear in larger prefixes: for $s > \ell$, the prefixes $w_{4s+2}$ and $w_{4s+4}$ has too long central factors that $v$ has to contain, while $w_{4s+1}$ and $w_{4s+3}$ have central factors $w_{4\ell+1}$, resp. $w_{4\ell+3}$ and these cases have been already discussed.

If $v$ is not a $\vartheta$-palindrome, then the only extension of $v$ is $avb$, thus $v$ is not a bispecial. If $v$ is an $E$-palindrome, then its only extension is $av\overline{a}$ and we do not get any new extension by application of $E$. Hence $v$ is not a bispecial. If $v$ is an $R$-palindrome, but distinct from $s_{4\ell+1}$, then its extension is $ava$ and we do not get any new extension by application of $R$. Finally, if $v = s_{4\ell+1}$, then its extension is $av\overline{a}$ and by application of $R$ we get $\overline{a}va$, thus $v$ is a weak bispecial.

3. Let $k = 4\ell + 2$. This case is an analogy of the first paragraph.

4. Let $k = 4\ell + 3$. This case is an analogy of the second paragraph.

□

*Proof of Proposition 26.* Putting together Lemmas 30 and 37, Proposition 26 is proven. □

# 8 Open problems

A lot of problems concerning generalized pseudostandard words remain still open:

- A new upper bound on the complexity of generalized pseudostandard words.
  We do not have enough observations to state a new conjecture, nevertheless in our computer experiments, we have on one hand several examples – including the word

$\mathbf{u_p}$ – where $\limsup \frac{\mathcal{C}(n)}{n}$ seems to be greater than 4. On the other hand, in all our examples $\limsup \frac{\mathcal{C}(n)}{n}$ is likely less than or equal to 5.

- Study of fixed points of generalized pseudopalindromic closures.
  We suggest to start with periodic fixed points. A big problem here is that the same generalized pseudostandard word can be generated by many distinct directive bisequences.

- Description of those generalized pseudostandard words that are fixed points of substitutions or providing at least large classes of such words.

- Study of generalized pseudostandard words with seed where besides the directive bisequence a short prefix of the generated infinite word is prescribed.

# 9 Appendix

In this appendix, we list all members of the sequence $(w_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ for the infinite word $\mathbf{u_p} = \mathbf{u}(1^\omega, (EERR)^\omega)$ that we needed in Section 7. For their generation the program Sage [11] was used.

$w_1 = 10$

$w_2 = 1010$

$w_3 = 10101$

$w_4 = 1010110101$

$w_5 = 101011010110010100 1010$

$w_6 = 10101101011001010010101101011001010010 10$

$w_7 = 10101101011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010$
$1101010010100110101101$

$w_8 = 10101101011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010$
$11010100101001101011010110010100101011010110010100101$
$01001010011010110101001010011010110101$

$w_9 = 10101101011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010$
$11010100101001101011010110010100101011010110010100101$
$01001010011010110101001010011010110101100101001010011$
$01011010100101001101011010101101011001010010101101011$
$00101001010011010110101001010011010110101011010110010$
$10010101101011001010010 10$

$w_{10} = 10110101100101001010110101100101001010100101001101011$
$01010010100110101101011001010010101101011001010010101$
$00101001101011010100101001101011010110010100101001101$
$01101010010100110101101010110101100101001010110101100$
$10100101001101011010010100110101101010110101100101010$
$01010110101100101001010100101001101011010100101001101$
$01101011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010110$
$10100101001101011010110010100101001101011010100101001$
$10101101010110101100101001010110101100101001010011010$
$11010100101001101011010101101011001010010101101011001$
$01001010$

$w_{11} = 10101101011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010$
$11010100101001101011010110010100101011010110010100101$
$01001010011010110101001010011010110101100101001010011$
$01011010010100110101101010110101100101001010110101011$
$00101001010011010110101001010011010110101011010110010$
$10010101101011001010010101001010011010110101001010011$
$01011010110010100101101011001010010101001010011010101$
$10101001010011010110101100101001010011010110101001010$
$01101011010101101011001010010101101011001010010100110$
$10110101001010011010110101011010110010100101011010110$
$01010010101001010011010110101001010011010110101011010$
$11001010010101101011001010010100110101101010010100110$
$10110101011010110010100101011010110010100101001101011$
$01011001010010101101011001010010101001010011010110101$
$00101001101011010110010100101011010110010100101010010$
$10011010110101001010011010110101011010110010100101011$
$01011001010010100110101101010010100110101101010110101$
$10010100101011010110010100101001101011010110010100101$
$01101011001010010101001010011010110101001010011010110$
$10110010100101011010110010100101010010100110101101010$
$01010011010110101$

# References


[1] M. Bucci, A. de Luca, A. De Luca, and L. Zamboni. On Some Problems Related to Palindrome Closure. *RAIRO – Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 42:679–700, 2008.

[2] J. Cassaigne. Complexité et facteurs spéciaux. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin*, 4:67–88, 1997.

[3] X. Droubay, J. Justin, and G. Pirillo. Episturmian Words and Some Constructions of de Luca and Rauzy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 225:539–553, 2001.

[4] T. Jajcayová, E. Pelatová, Š. Starosta. Palindromic Closures Using Multiple Antimorphisms. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 533:37–45, 2014.

[5] D. Jamet, G. Paquin, G. Richomme, and L. Vuillon. On the Fixed Points of the Iterated Pseudopalindromic Closure. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412:2974–2987, 2011.

[6] A. de Luca. Sturmian Words: Structure, Combinatorics, and their Arithmetics. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 183:45–82, 1997.

[7] A. de Luca, A. De Luca. Pseudopalindromic Closure Operators in Free Monoids. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 362:282–300, 2006.

[8] A. B. Massé, G. Paquin, H. Tremblay, and L. Vuillon. On Generalized Pseudostandard Words over Binary Alphabet. *Journal of Int. Sequences*, 16:Article 13.2.11, 2013.

[9] M. Morse, G. A. Hedlund. Symbolic dynamics. *Amer. J. Math.*, 60:815–866, 1938.

[10] M. Morse, G. A. Hedlund. Symbolic dynamics II: Sturmian trajectories. *Amer. J. Math.*, 62 (1):1–42, 1940.

[11] W. A. Stein et al. Sage Mathematics Software. *The Sage Developement Team, www.sagemath.org*, 2010.